

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 8-13, 17, 30 and 32 have been canceled. Claims 6, 14, 28 and 29 have been amended. Claims 33 and 34 are newly added. No new matter has been added.

The present application was previously allowed and prosecution on the merits was closed (see Notice of Allowance mailed on May 13, 2005). However, after Applicants paid the issue fee, prosecution was re-opened, and the present Office Action was mailed.

Claims 28 and 29 currently stand allowed. Claims 1-4, 6-17 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent no. 6,275,693 of Lin et al. ("Lin").

Applicants thank the examiner for maintaining the allowance of claims 28 and 29. Applicants do not believe the amendments to those claims alter their allowability.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the other pending claims. Note that the claim amendments above are done only to correct minor informalities and/or to put the claims in what Applicants consider to be better form. The amendments are not made in response to the rejection or to comply with any statutory requirement of patentability, since no such amendment is believed to be necessary.

Independent claim 6 recites:

6. (Currently amended) A method for a proxy server to provide a proxy server based service to a mobile communications device, the method comprising:

receiving a request from the mobile communications device to access the proxy server based service;  
processing the request to access the proxy server based service;  
and  
**sending a result of said processing the request to access the proxy server based service to the mobile communications device** for forwarding to a network server via a secure connection established between the mobile communications device and the network server, the secure connection-having been established by tunneling through the proxy server.  
(Emphasis added.)

Lin fails to disclose or suggest such a method. In particular, Lin does not disclose or suggest sending the result of processing a request to access a proxy server based service to a mobile communications device. Further, Lin does not disclose or suggest that such a result is sent to a mobile communications device for forwarding to a network server.

Lin discloses a method for performing bearer-independent wireless application service provisioning. The disclosed method involves using a provisioning proxy 110 to facilitate creation of a tunnel between a mobile communication device 102 and a provisioning center 116 (see Figure 1). The Examiner cites Lin as allegedly disclosing the above-emphasized claim feature ("sending a result . . .") at col. 4, lines 42 to col. 5, line 12. Specifically, the Examiner cites Lin's disclosure that a tunnel is established through the proxy server (Office Action, p. 4).

As far as Lin discloses, the provisioning proxy 110 merely facilitates creation of the tunnel, by locating and contacting the provisioning center 116 and then providing the provisioning center 116 with a temporary tunnel identifier to identify the mobile device (col. 4, lines 46-56). The provisioning center 116 then initiates the tunnel. In contrast with claim 6, however, Lin does not disclose that the provisioning proxy 110 (or any

other device) sends the result of processing a request to access a proxy server based service to a mobile communications device. Assuming *arguendo* the provisioning proxy's function of facilitating creation of the tunnel is considered a "proxy server based service", the provisioning proxy 116 does not send any result of that operation to the mobile communication device, and it certainly does not send such a result to the mobile communication device for forwarding to a network server. To the contrary, the provisioning proxy 110 merely provides information to the provisioning center 116, to allow the provisioning center to initiated the tunnel (col. 4, lines 46-56).

For at least this reason, therefore, claim 6 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 14 includes similar limitations to those discussed above regarding claim 6 and is, therefore, patentable over the cited art for similar reasons along with its dependent claims.

As indicated above, claims 28 and 29 stand allowed. The amendments to those claims are not believed to alter their allowability.

New claim 33 includes limitations similar to those in allowed claim 28 and/or 29, and is therefore allowable (along with dependent claim 34) for similar reasons.

#### Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 12/29/05

  
Jordan M. Becker  
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300